

Federal and Selected State Governments of Nigeria - DFID Nigeria

**Capacity for UBE (CUBE)
Output to Purpose Review**

**Revised
15 October 2007**

**Capacity for Universal Basic Education (CUBE)
3rd Output to Purpose Review
September - October 2007**

Contents

<i>Abbreviations</i>	<i>ii</i>
Executive Summary	iv
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 OPR methodology	3
1.3 OPR scope, limitations, acknowledgements	5
2 2007 OUTPUT TO PURPOSE REVIEW OF CUBE	7
2.1 Project management and logframe	7
2.1 Progress towards achieving CUBE purpose and outputs	8
2.3 CUBE finances	11
2.4 CUBE impact and issues	13
3 RISKS AND SUSTAINABILITY	20
3.1 Risks and threats	20
3.2 Sustainability	22
4 RECOMMENDATIONS AND WAY AHEAD	25
4.1 Recommendations	25
4.2 Post OPR action plan	27
4.3 Eleven lessons for ESSPIN	28

ANNEXES

Annex A	OPR TOR
Annex B	OPR Report Form
Annex C	EMIS, Education Sector Planning and School Mapping
Annex D	Visit to Kwara, Kano and Kaduna States
Annex E	Kano State: Visit to Minjibir LGEA and Schools

Abbreviations

A&E	Architecture and Environment
AAN	Action Aid Nigeria
AWP	Annual Work Plan
BC	British Council
CBO	Community-Based Organisations
CE	Cambridge Education
CPS	Country Partnership Strategy
CUBE	Capacity for Universal Basic Education
DFID	Department for International Development
DLP	Deputy Lead Person
DP	Development Partners
EFA	Education for All
EMIS	Education Management Information System
EOP	End of Project
ESP	Education Strategic Plan
ESSPIN	Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria
FBO	Faith Based Organisation
FCT	Federal Capital Territory
FGN	Federal Government of Nigeria
FMoE	Federal Ministry of Education
FY	Financial Year
GEP	Girls' Education Project
GER	Gross Enrolment Ratio
HC	Honourable Commissioner
HIV&AIDS	Human Immuno-deficiency Virus and Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
ICT	Information and Communications Technology
IDA	International Development Assistance
IDP	International Development Partners
IGDP	Integrated Growth and Development Programme
IQTE	Islamiyyah, Qur'anic and Tsangaya Education
JSS	Junior Secondary School
LF	Logical Framework (logframe)
LGA	Local Government Authority
LGEA	Local Government Education Authority
LP	Lead Person
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MIS	Management Information System
MLA	Measurement of Learning Achievement
MNS	Minimum National Standards
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MoV	Means of Verification
MTEF	Medium Term Expenditure Framework
NCE	National Council for Education
NEEDS	National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy
NEMIS	Nigeria Education Management Information System
NER	Net Enrolment Ratio
NGO	Non-governmental Organisations
NO	No Objection
NTI	National Teachers' Institute
NUT	Nigeria Union of Teachers
OPR	Output to Purpose Review
OVI	Observable Verifiable Indicator
P1, P2, ...	Primary year 1, year 2, etc
PCU	Project Coordination Unit

PPA	Project Plan of Action
PPCP	Public sector, Private sector, Community Partnership
PR	Public Relations
PS	Permanent Secretary
PSU	Project Support Unit
PTA	Parent-Teacher Association
PTR	Pupil Teacher Ratio
QQT	Quality, Quantity, Time
SBMC	School-Based Management Committee
SDP	School Development Plan/Planning
SDS	School Development Scheme
SEEDS	State Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy
SEPA	Senior Education Policy Adviser
SESP	State Education Support Project
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound
SMoE	State Ministry of Education
SPIC	State Project Implementation Committee (for SESP)
SSEC	Senior Secondary Education Commission
SMoF	State Ministry of Finance
SSS	Senior Secondary School
STL	State Team Leader
SUBEB	State Universal Basic Education Board
SWAp	Sector Wide Approach
TA	Technical Assistance/Technical Assistant(s)
TAMC	Technical Assistance Management Consortium
TL	Team Leader
TOR	Terms of Reference
UBE	Universal Basic Education
UBEC	Universal Basic Education Commission
UBEP	Universal Basic Education Project
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Emergency Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VFM	Value for money
WB	World Bank

Capacity for Universal Basic Education (CUBE) 3rd Output to Purpose Review September - October 2007

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The annual Output-to-Purpose Review (OPR) of the Capacity for Universal Basic Education (CUBE) project took place in September/October 2007. Technically this was the third CUBE OPR. However it was CUBE's first review following the implementation of a radical readjustment of the project in July 2006, subsequent to the cancellation of the World Bank (WB) assisted Universal Basic Education Project (UBEP). During the fifteen months since the previous OPR, CUBE has provided support for UBE activities in Nigeria, including support to education reforms in the Federal Ministry of Education (FMoE) and preparations for the WB-supported State Education Sector Project (SESP) in three selected States, Kaduna, Kano and Kwara.

The OPR includes, as a primary output, a performance review of CUBE, supplemented by a completed standard DFID annual report form (Annex B) and, as secondary outputs, recommendations, as well as lessons that might be applied to the Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria (ESSPIN).

Section 1

Section 1 contains the background of CUBE and an outline of the process and limitations of the OPR.

Section 2

Section 2 is the main OPR in which the performance of CUBE is assessed as to whether the project purpose and outputs will be achieved if it continues its present approach.

Findings: Purpose rating: 2 [*i.e. likely to be largely achieved*]

The '2' score was proposed by the 2 independent members of the OPR team and was discussed more widely at a meeting of DFID and representatives of their country partner, World Bank.

Output rating: 2

[Based on three outputs with individual scores of 1, 2, 2]

CUBE scored consistently well on Outputs 1 (Federal level inputs), 2 (State level inputs) and 3 (SESP support).

The OPR team is generally satisfied that the main outputs will mostly be achieved by end of project (EOP).

Federal level inputs (Output 1): Performance at this level has been impressive. Considerable progress was made in support of the education reform programme of the outgoing government, with a 10-year Education Strategic Plan and a Reform Strategy in place by March 2007. Assistance to EMIS continued to be a major achievement of CUBE, although questions are beginning to be asked about government's commitment and broader understanding of the role and value of EMIS as a whole. Limited support has been provided to date to FIS and to UBEC but this is expected to be enhanced in the final year of CUBE, including direct support to UBEC by the Senior Education Policy Adviser (SEPA) who will be based there. It will be important to establish professional contact with the incoming Minister of Education with a view to ascertaining and providing appropriate future support.

State level inputs (Output 2): There is little question that concentration on just three States (instead of the previous 16) has made CUBE more effective. Value has been added in the two lead States (Kaduna and Kano), and, most impressively, in the non-lead State (Kwara). Although the OPR team is fairly confident that provided the current levels of industry and application are maintained, most of the OVIs will be attained before EOP, we recommend that more be done to ensure full participation of the SUBEBs in the CUBE and SESP processes.

SESP support (Output 3): On the whole the OPR team considers that the CUBE approach and its delivery structures are suitable for SESP attainment. Expertise in World Bank procurement procedures is beginning to emerge in the SMOEs, with letters of no objection (NO) to procurement requests becoming more and more frequent as SESP approaches its launch. This said, there are perceptions in the SESP sponsors that some outputs may be slow in arriving (e.g. in Inspection and Capacity Support sub-components). Nevertheless, CUBE dedicates virtually all of its efforts to SESP and played a major supportive role in the SESP project appraisal, approval and preparation processes. This has left very little opportunity or spare capacity for other non-SESP government priorities for UBE activities, such as support for nomadic education and/or Islamiyyah schools.

Section 3

Section 3 argues that CUBE remains a **high risk** project and that there are serious issues regarding project sustainability. With regard to the latter, there appears to be low institutional demand on the part of Federal and State government for some of the CUBE components (e.g. EMIS and NEMIS, but not only these). The decision taken by States to "locate" the SESP and CUBE State teams in the SmoEs, rather than the SUBEBs may be a contributor to sustainability concerns. It would be unwise and it is probably too late in the CUBE programme to change current approaches, but the development of greater strategic awareness (and ensuring that governments demonstrate real commitment to UBE) is something that the ESSPIN designers and managers will need to take account of.

Section 4

The OPR report closes with recommendations, an outline action plan for improvement and some lessons that ESSPIN may wish to consider.

Recommendations: Some of the key recommendations are:

- Brief the incoming Minister of Education on CUBE and determine whether modifications are required to address new Government policy directions
- Modify the project logframe in line with the CUBE Management Roadmap
- Ensure that the UBEC-SUBEB-LGEA axis is much more involved in the SESP process
- Follow up publication of the revised, realistic, costed ESP/ESOP by appropriate capacity building measures (e.g. in linking costing models to planning, sector prioritisation and to the budgetary process) in the States at senior management, planning and operational levels
- Provide support to EDB to consolidate EMIS activities in as many States as possible during 2007-08 (but do not attempt to introduce new concepts, software and hardware before the present models have been universalised and internalised)
- Ensure STILs provide sufficient support to States to understand, own and apply results of 10 Year Planning process

Table 4.1 on pp 25-27 extends and justifies the above list.

Post OPR action: The following table, abridged from Table 4.2 on page 27, proposes a sequence for post OPR action. Particular note should be taken of responsibilities, outputs, start dates and target dates.

Priority Start	Action	Who, Outputs, Targets
1 By 31 Oct	Amend logframe outputs immediately so that they accurately inform the remaining 11 months of CUBE and are measurable for the next OPR	<i>TAMC with DFID oversight: Amended LF by 12 Oct 2007</i>
2 ASAP	Brief incoming Minister of Education on CUBE and determine whether modifications are required to address new Government policy directions	<i>DFID with TAMC</i>
3 Immediately	Review the role and TORs for the SEPA, ensuring a closer institutional link with Federal institutions (probably UBEC) with a possible responsibility for ensuring greater SUBEBs interaction with CUBE-SESP	<i>TAMC with DFID-WB oversight TORs by 31 October</i>
4 Immediately	Complete and implement the Communications strategy and Federal and State levels.	<i>TAMC (with the assistance of the PR expertise currently in UNICEF Field Office D)</i>

<p>5 now and ongoing</p>	<p>Release PER reports and use them to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare costed ESP and ESOP • Provide appropriate capacity building measures for senior and middle management in the development of costing models that link the costed ESP to UBE planning, prioritisation and the annual budget cycle • Ensure that State and LGA budgets work plans are realistic, timed and costed in line with the revised ESP/ESOP • Establish M&E systems that link to the annual work plans 	<p><i>DFID-WB and TAMC Revised, costed ESPs by 31/03/07 Revised, costed ESOPs by 31/03/07 Senior planners trained by 03/08 ESOP informs the 2009 budget 2009 SESP work plans informed by ESOP</i></p>
<p>6 Ongoing to EOP</p>	<p>Complete training of trainers for a) SBMCs, b) Headteachers, c) Teachers, b) c) Inspectors by EOP Ensure SMBCs are able to produce robust School Development Schemes</p>	<p><i>All trainers of trainers for SBMCs, head teachers and teachers in CUBE schools trained 21 Trained inspectors (7/State)</i></p>

ESSPIN: The report closes on pages 28 - 29 with eleven lessons for ESSPIN. Of these, the most important is “be strategic”.

End of Executive Summary

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

1.1.1 **CUBE History:** In September 2003 the Capacity for Universal Basic Education project (CUBE) was launched in support of (and concurrently with) the IDA-funded, World Bank-assisted Universal Basic Education Project (UBEP). CUBE is funded by the Nigeria office of the UK Department for International Development (DFID) and is managed by a DFID-appointed Technical Assistance Management Consortium (TAMC) comprising Action Aid Nigeria (AAN), Cambridge Education (CE) and, as consortium leader, the British Council (BC). CUBE is due to terminate on 31 August 2008.

From 2003 to 2006 CUBE-UBEP was active in 16 States¹ and in eight national education parastatals and aimed to assist the development of the Federal Government of Nigeria (FGN) universal basic education (UBE) programme. Following dissatisfaction with project performance, UBEP was terminated with effect from 30 June 2006 by mutual agreement of FGN and WB. UBEP is due to be replaced by the WB-supported State Education Support Project (SESP) which will be launched in November 2007. During the 15 months from July 2006, CUBE support to UBE continued at Federal level, where it assisted the education reform programme of the outgoing government, and at State level, where it has supported the design and pre-project activities of SESP in three selected States². For the remainder of the project, CUBE will continue to provide support to the Federal Ministry of Education (FMoE), to the Federal Inspectorate Service and to the UBE Commission, UBEC. However, its principal area of operations in its remaining year will be to support (i) the costing of Education Sector Plans and Education Sector Operational Plans, and (ii) the implementation activities of SESP in the three selected States.

1.1.2 **Output to Purpose Review (OPR):** DFID requires there to be an annual OPR of CUBE. The first OPR reported on 19 July 2005, 15 months after the end of the project's 6-month inception period. The second OPR reported in July 2006. This is the report of the third OPR, the Terms of Reference (TOR) for which appear at Annex A.

1.1.3 **CUBE logframe:** The second OPR recommended in July 2006 that DFID and TAMC make '*slight adjustments to the CUBE logframe to reflect emphasis on the SESP States and less Federal level engagement*'. However, the logframe was not adjusted until 4 September 2007. There are a number of reasons for this delay, including CUBE's involvement in support for the Federal reform process and the more radical refocusing of the programme that was

¹ Bayelsa, Benue, Borno, Ebonyi, Ekiti, Enugu, Imo, Jigawa, Kaduna, Katsina, Lagos, Niger, Oyo, Plateau, Rivers, Taraba

² Kaduna, Kano, Kwara

required to support State implementation of the SESP. The length of time taken for the publication of the SESP Project Appraisal Document (PAD), which first appeared (with restricted distribution only) on 30 March 2007, was also a factor. In the interim period, the project was guided by a *CUBE Management Road Map*, jointly prepared by DFID and TAMC in February 2007. Notwithstanding these considerations, the OPR team is concerned at the very late production of these documents and at being requested to conduct an OPR based on a logframe that was produced just 7 days prior to the review (and then further readjusted 3 days before the review). Paragraphs 1.3.3, 2.1.4, 2.1.5 contain further comments on and analysis of the logframe and the Road Map.

1.1.4 **The goal of CUBE** remains “UBE in Nigeria” for which the achievement of the education Millennium Development Goals (MDG) 2 and 3 (universal primary education, and equal gender balance throughout education by 2015) provide the objectively verifiable indicators (OVIs). It should be noted that the Nigerian versions of these MDGs are, respectively, “to achieve universal primary and junior secondary education” and “to promote gender equality & empower women”.

1.1.5 **The purpose of CUBE** is also unchanged in the revised logframe: the “development and implementation of sustainable federal and selected state programmes for UBE with priority given to educationally disadvantaged LGAs”. The purpose OVIs are:

- a) Federal and state level plans for UBE produced, costed, approved and resourced by EOP,
- b) Strengthened capacity of school system to deliver quality education by EOP,
- c) Increased basic education school access, retention and achievement with priority given to the poorest areas and girls.

The original logframe had five outputs. In September these were reduced to three new outputs with a distinctly different emphasis from before. In the revised logframe (7 September version), the purpose is to be achieved through delivery against the following outputs:

- 1) Enhanced capacity within the FME and key parastatals to lead policy and planning of education reform in Nigeria;
- 2) Enhanced capacity of X selected Lead States³ to achieve UBE, with a focus on educationally disadvantaged LGEAs and communities;

³ It is not clear whether X = 3 (Kaduna, Kano, Kwara) or X > 3 within the lifetime of CUBE. DFID and WB distinguish between lead States (Kaduna and Kano) and selected States (currently Kwara). This distinction is somewhat blurred within the language of purposes 2 and 3 of the logframe. For ease of reference, this report will refer to the three States simply as ‘the selected States’. It is anticipated that further States will be selected for future inclusion within SESP and the forthcoming DFID project, Education Support Programme in Nigeria (ESSPIN).

- 3) Enhanced capacity of selected Lead States to access World Bank credit and implement SESP projects in selected LGEAs.

This OPR is guided by the above outputs and purpose.

1.1.6 **The DFID-World Bank partnership:** The 2005 IDA-DFID *Country Partnership Strategy (CPS)* sets out a joint strategy for WB-DFID support to education in Nigeria. Publication of the CPS formalised a number of inputs in recent years, typical of which were the interactions between CUBE (DFID supported), UBEP (DFID and World Bank) and SESP (DFID and World Bank). Section 1.1.1 above describes some of the linkages between the three projects.

Unfortunately, it became clear to the OPR team (Box 1.1. below) that although there is strong unity of purpose in the CPS (e.g. the promotion of UBE), there are some strains in the partnership, mostly arising from the distinctly different operational climates of the two organisations. In common with other global organisations (such as the UN agencies), the World Bank has a set of well-established procedures and processes, particularly those relating to project design, approval and procurement, which it applies with little deviation across international boundaries. DFID takes a more flexible approach; and is prepared to adjust processes to suit local and national conditions. These different approaches manifest themselves in various ways, most notably complaints about delays, flexibility issues (not enough/too much) and varying perceptions about the time required for new approaches to become embedded and owned by the benefiting groups (such as the introduction of Sector Wide approaches). There is a danger that the shared unity of purpose is at risk of becoming subordinated to operational differences. This sometimes places delivery agencies, such as TAMC, in a difficult situation.

Under the terms of the CPS, the OPR should, perhaps, have been a joint DFID-WB review. Although the OPR was well informed by WB participation in the review process (two formal meetings and a number of informal contacts), the OPR was *de facto* not a joint review. This, perhaps, is something that should be reconsidered in future.

1.2 OPR methodology

1.2.1 **Consultants:** The in-country components of the OPR were conducted during the two weeks from 10 to 24 September 2007 by a consultancy team comprising two independent consultants supported by two DFID personnel (Box 1.1).

Box 1.1: OPR Team

Sulleiman Adediran	Independent Consultant, SAA Consults	Nigeria
Ian Attfield ⁴	Education Adviser	DFID Nigeria (Kano)

⁴ Joined the team in Kano State and attended start-up meeting with DFID and wrap-up meetings with WB and TAMC. The OPR benefited from (i) his considerable ICT-EMIS expertise, and (ii) the illustrated notes that he made during the Kano visit to schools (see Annexes C and E respectively).

Murray Macrae (TL)	Independent Consultant, MMD	UK
Rob Shooter ⁵	Programme Coordinator	DFID Nigeria (Abuja)

- 1.2.2 **Within Abuja:** The team received an initial briefing from TAMC on the CUBE annual report and received subsequent briefing from DFID senior staff. Discussions were also held with World Bank. Visits were made to
- the Federal Ministry of Education’s Planning Department, Statistics Department and Inspection Services;
 - the UBE Commission (UBEC).
- It was not possible to meet the Honourable Minister for Education.
- 1.2.3 **Field visits:** Two-day field visits were made to each of Kwara, Kano and Kaduna States. During these visits, the team met the following:
- Honourable Commissioners for Education (or their representatives),
 - State Ministry of Education (SMoE) Permanent Secretaries and Directors,
 - State UBE Board (SUBEB) Chairpersons (or acting Chairpersons) and SUBEB Directors,
 - SESP Project Support Units (PSU) including Lead and Deputy Lead persons,
 - Members of LGEAs including secretaries, PTA leaders, SBMC chairpersons, Inspectors, Headteachers and Principals
 - Members of the CUBE Offices, including the State Team Leaders (STL)
 - The DFID Kano Field Office (twice).
- In addition, visits were made to two schools in each of Kano and Kaduna States.
- 1.2.4 **Wrap-up meetings:** Feed back meetings were held with World Bank and TAMC in Abuja on Friday 21 September. On Monday 24 September a final debriefing and power-point presentation was made to DFID Nigeria and WB representatives,. During these wrap-up meetings, frank and detailed discussions were held on the following: OPR initial conclusions tentatively reached during the field visits; CUBE responses to change (especially during the last quarter of 2006 and the first quarter of 2007); project management; partnership issues, the log frame; possibilities for continuation of support beyond CUBE closure in August 2008, via the proposed DFID Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria (ESSPIN).
- 1.2.5 **Literature review:** A review of relevant literature was undertaken. The following reports/documents were particularly illuminating:
- CUBE Annual report 2006/7, 8 Sept 2007*
 - CUBE Baseline Study (draft), September 2007*
 - CUBE Quarterly reports (various, to June 2007)*

⁵ Was with the team throughout (apart from some early visits to Federal agencies and WB) and provided general oversight of the OPR and guidance on DFID requirements. His ongoing advice and insights, and his contribution to a critique of this report in its final stages added considerable value.

- *CUBE Revised Log Frame (various iterations: 4 Sept and 7 Sept, 2007)*
- *CUBE Road Map (Various iterations from March 07 to 8 June 2007)*
- *EMIS Annual report 2006/7, CUBE, 4 Sept 2007*
- *FME National Framework for Education, 2006*
- *Kano State Roadmap, Sept 2007*
- *Kano, Kaduna, Kwara 10 Year Education Sector Plans and 3 Year Education Sector Operational Plans, 2006, 2007*
- *World Bank, Project Appraisal Document, State Education Sector Project, 30 March 2007*

Please refer to Annex B, Part E, for a comprehensive list of literature available to the team.

1.3 OPR scope, limitations, acknowledgements

1.3.1 **OPR scope:** Section 2 comprises the primary output of the OPR: a performance review of CUBE for the fifteen months ending September 2007 including the formal OPR, financial performance and notes on CUBE impact. Section 3 contains a risk assessment and a discussion on sustainability. Finally, Section 4 contains project recommendations and, by way of a forward look, outline proposals for a final year action plan for CUBE, as well as some lessons that may be applicable to the incoming ESSPIN. Annex A contains a detailed exposition of the OPR scope.

1.3.2 **Annexes:** In addition to Annex A (TOR) four other Annexes inform this report:

Annex B: This Annex is a completed DFID reporting form for project and programme review. It contains reports of performance against all of the project OVIs and how these relate to the outputs and the purpose. The detail contained in Annex B is not repeated in the main body of the report; rather, it is used to support arguments, conclusions and recommendations in the report. *It is recommended that close attention be given to the contents of Annex B.*

Annex C: A discussion of EMIS and school mapping issues

Annex D: Individual State Visit reports containing State-specific discussions and data which are explicitly or implicitly referred to throughout the report (and in Annex B)

Annex E: Supplementary report on visits to schools in Kano State

1.3.3 **Limitations** of the OPR are listed below:

a) **Sampling:** Visits to states, LGEAs and schools were extremely brief. There is no guarantee how representative the visits were, or of the validity of the conclusions reached. However there were many consistent observations noted during the visits and this gives some confidence that the report is generally based on sound findings.

- b) **Logframe:** Any OPR is based on the project logframe. The team was concerned that the output section of the current logframe appeared to be a very recent addition to project documentation, rather than the underpinning project driver that it should be (see paragraphs 1.1.3 and 1.1.5 above). In some places the logframe seemed to have been tailored to fit activities, rather than the other way round. Despite these concerns, it was decided to conduct the OPR against the logframe as presented.
- c) **Informants:** Many of the key posts at both Federal and State level had still to be filled (or made substantive), or had been recently filled, following the elections. This raises difficulties regarding the reliability or durability of the advice received from some key informants.

- 1.3.5 **Acknowledgements:** The OPR team is most grateful to the in-country DIFD and TAMC officers for general facilitation of the review: in particular for making all the arrangements and providing logistics for the visits and for making literature and information available, and for helpful and open discussions.

The presence, guidance and interaction of two senior DFID personnel added considerable value to the OPR, to the State visits and to ongoing and follow-up discussions. The external consultants particularly wish to express their appreciation to Ian Attfield of DFID Kano Office for Annexes C and E.

We are particularly grateful to the many people who made themselves available for discussion, advice and observation: the head teachers, and other citizens in the LGEAs, the officials in the three SUBEBs and SMOEs, and, not least, the members of the three SESP PSUs who were very helpful and informative.

2 2007 OUTPUT TO PURPOSE REVIEW OF CUBE

2.1 Project management and logframe

- 2.1.1 **CUBE 2006 revitalisation and turn-around:** Before presenting the OPR in detail, the review team wishes to comment on the realignment of CUBE following the 2006 joint DFID-WB OPR and the termination of the UBEP project. In mid 2006, TAMC, the CUBE management team, were obliged to cease activities in 16 States and in about eight parastatals, concluding the contracts of numerous national and some international technical assistants (TA) and closing down State-based offices. Simultaneously, TAMC revitalised its central management team (in Abuja) and opened new, more substantial offices in Kaduna, Kano and Kwara states in anticipation of provision of support for developing sector-wide education strategic plans, the provision of UBE capacity development inputs and the establishment and training of Project Support Units (PSU) to support SESP during a lengthy pre-project implementation period and beyond. Related to this, during the nine-month period to March 2007, CUBE provided various technical assistance to SESP pre-appraisal and appraisal activities, including support for project preparation activities and appraisal teams, while simultaneously providing start-up developmental activities, including strategic planning, within the three States. During this period CUBE also provided significant support to the FME for its education reform process.
- 2.1.2 **Creditable performance:** In the view of the OPR team the detailed inventory of mostly high-quality outputs produced at a time when radical management restructuring was taking place represents a considerable achievement and is a credit to the professionalism, change-management abilities and flexible approaches of those involved. As far as the OPR team could ascertain, CUBE TA has on the whole been of good quality, appropriate to partners' needs and delivered in a way that has helped to build capacity. These comments should be kept in mind when reading subsequent parts of this report which may appear to be critical.
- 2.1.3 **Reporting:** Reporting by STLs and other TA to central TAMC appears efficient and comprehensive. Quarterly reports are provided to DFID on time, are consistent in format and contain a suitable blend of statistical and other narrative evidence. Financial reporting and project disbursement appear to be satisfactory (but see the related comments in Section 2.3 below).
- 2.1.4 **Logical framework and road map:** Paragraph 1.1.3 has already pointed out the need to have a logframe that is the 'mother planning tool' for the project; one that should be written in advance of activities and not afterwards. The reasons for delays in the revision of the logframe are set out in para 1.1.3. In the absence of an updated logframe, DFID, WB and TAMC jointly produced a CUBE Road Map in February 2007 to guide the project. The Road Map is a useful

document and appears to have acted as a logframe substitute until late in the day when the actual logframe was adjusted in September 2007. Indeed there are some respects in which the road map is actually a better reflection of what CUBE activities should be than the logframe that was actually produced. This said, it is important that the logframe be finally updated, brought closely in line with the road map (which does appear appropriate to CUBE) and used, along with the road map, to guide CUBE towards completion. When doing this partners should make sure that there are only about three to five OVIs for each purpose and that the OVIs are realistic, measurable and QQT (quantifiable, quality-focussed and time-bound).

- 2.1.5 **Logframe adjustment:** The current Goal and Purpose should not be changed. However, within three weeks of acceptance of this report (and before SESP launch) DFID and TAMC should meet either to confirm the present logframe or to adjust the purposes and related OVIs making them more QQT. This should make clear what is expected by EOP. This should only take a day or two but may need the presence and assistance of someone who is knowledgeable about logframes.

2.2 Progress towards achieving CUBE purpose and outputs

- 2.2.1 **Annex B, the DFID report form:** Annex B contains, *inter alia*, the OPR team's assessment of (i) progress towards achieving the CUBE purpose and, in some detail, (ii) performance in the three CUBE outputs as measured against the OVIs that appear in the logframe, revised 7 September⁶. Annex B includes the goal, purpose, outputs and OVIs of the current logframe as well as detailed accounts of performance against the OVIs. The annex also explains the 5-point scoring system.

Sections 2.2.2 – 2.2.4 below are derived from Annex B, pp 3 - 8 (q.v.).

- 2.2.2 **Achievement of purpose:** The project purpose, score and summary findings are provided below:

Purpose:

Development and implementation of sustainable federal and selected state programmes for UBE with priority given to educationally disadvantaged LGAs

Score: 2 (likely to be largely achieved by EOP)

21 out of the 83 (25.3%) LGEAs in the three States were targeted for support using gender gaps criteria, while ensuring an equitable geopolitical spread within each State..

The three purpose indicators are given below. Each is followed by a brief comment on progress, which, when confabulated, provides a justification for the above score.

⁶ As presented on pp 30 – 33 of the *CUBE Annual Report 2006/7*, 10 September 2007

1. *Federal and state level plans for UBE produced, costed, approved and resourced by EOP*
 In late 2006/early 2007, CUBE very successfully supported the development of a coherent national education reform programme; likewise 10 year Education Strategic Plans (ESP) for FME and the three State SMOEs, which will be costed by December 2007. It remains to be seen whether the incoming Minister of Education will accept the reform programme or request further adjustments.

2. *Strengthened capacity of school system to deliver quality education by EOP*
 Capacity building inputs have taken place in all three States with SESP PSUs established and trained. LGEAs have been sensitised and training manuals are in place for the training of trainers, especially for the development of School Based Management Committees (SBMC) and School Development Schemes (SDS).

3. *Increased basic education school access, retention and achievement with priority given to the poorest areas and girls*
 Access has increased over the project period and in all schools visited it was reported that retention was high at all levels. However the OPR team believes that this is largely attributable to the efforts of Federal and State authorities to promote UBE and SBMCs nationally (not CUBE). Nevertheless CUBE inputs have raised expectations of benefits likely to reach schools and this will have supported governmental access/retention interventions. For example schools were selected for inclusion in SESP on the basis of, inter alia, gender gaps in enrolment. The SESP is designed to deliver quantified improvements in access, gender balance and learning achievement by the end of its four year term. The OPR coincided with the arrival of the first draft of the CUBE-commissioned Baseline Study in learning achievement. This very useful document confirms what many observers have already suspected: that literacy and numeracy levels of most learners (and their teachers) is abysmally low and are likely to remain so despite what CUBE may be able to do before EOP.

The above purpose indicators are likely to be largely achieved, particularly in important areas such as SBMC preparation and in paving the way for the States to draw down and utilise the SESP. There were impressive capacity gains in the first indicator.

2.2.3 **Progress towards delivering CUBE outputs:** Progress towards the various sub-components of the three project outputs is reported in Annex B. Scores and summary findings are provided below.

Output 1: Federal level

Enhanced capacity within the Federal Ministry of Education and key parastatals to lead policy and planning of education reform in Nigeria

Score: 1 (The output is well on the way to completion)

This output is well on the way to full achievement. FME has been and is being enhanced and a reform agenda has been developed with CUBE support. However, the status of the reform agenda remains to be resolved with the incoming Minister of Education who may wish to support the proposals but who may equally wish to adjust them according to the new government's stance.

Brief notes and comments on the OVIs for Output 1 are provided below:

OVI 1.1 Planning capacity:

Outputs, including a Federal level reform strategy, Federal and State 10-year ESPs (to be costed by December 2007) following sector situation analyses and UBE

policy studies were all completed on time. Some of the Federal documents are awaiting ratification.

OVI 1.2 EMIS and monitoring and evaluation:

EMIS policy document drafted and ratified by the Joint Consultative Committee on Education (JCCE), July 2007; NEMIS and EMIS data published (but not yet publicly available) within three months of census data becoming available; communication strategy and work plan drafted by end July 2007.⁷

OVI 1.3 UBEC strategic plans:

Strategy and work plans submitted to UBEC in July 2007; Senior Education Policy Advisor (SEPA) mobilised but not yet in post at UBEC

OVI 1.4 Support for federal inspectorate:

FIS plans published and approved

OVI 1.5 Capacity in planning and M&E:

M&E framework published and approved

Output 2: States level

Enhanced capacity of X⁸ selected lead States to achieve UBE with a focus on educationally disadvantaged LGEAs and communities

Score: 2 (likely to be largely achieved by EOP)

Achievement of this output is predicated upon the publication of a baseline study and Public Expenditure Reviews (PER), and a fully functioning EMIS that should inform the production of realistic costed 10-year plans (and medium term operational plans). When the latter are in place, it is anticipated that State capacity for UBE will follow

Brief notes and comments on the OVIs for Output 2 are provided below:

OVI 2.1 Baseline study and State EMIS:

EMIS installed and active in all three States; school mapping is incomplete [varies from 80% (Kano) to 95% (Kaduna)] and maps have yet to be distributed to SMOEs and SUBEBs; census data entry varies from 73% (Kano) to 95% (Kwara). However, the purpose and process of the school census is poorly understood at school and LGEA level leading to errors in data entry (and causing a re-running of the SESP data verification exercise in Kano State). Moreover, there appears to be little LGEA/SMoE institutional demand for education data. This may be partly because training in the use of EMIS (and inspection) reports is still to take place, but also reflects the lack of a culture of information-based decision making in Nigeria's education sector. The baseline study is at 1st Draft stage (and appears to be a potentially useful source for guiding educational planning).

OVI 2.2 PERs in 9 States:

PERs drafted and under consideration by DFID and WB. These now need to be improved (made more internally consistent) and circulated more widely (if only so that costing is properly informed). Again, it will be necessary for CUBE, DFID and WB to generate some institutional enthusiasm for these reviews and the uses to which they should be put.

OVI 1.3 Endorsed costed 10-year ESP and 3-year ESOP:

The initial ground work for these outputs has taken place. It is probable that

⁷ An outline communications strategy is under discussion with UBEC who are pressing for it to assist in the dissemination of UBE messages (as are officers at many other levels in the system including the States and LGEAs). [Note: TAMC reported progress on the communications strategy under 'EMIS' (OVI 1.2); this may be more appropriate under OVI 1.3, since this is an issue of priority concern to UBEC.]

⁸ Where X = 3 (!)

capacity will be built in this area and that the revised and updates ESPs and ESOPs will be ready for UBE financial and action planning by July 2008

Output 3: SESP Implementation

Enhanced capacity of selected Lead States to access World Bank credit and implement SESP projects in selected LGEAs

Score: 2 (likely to be largely achieved by EOP)

SESP is at 'pre-effectiveness' stage with project commencement now likely sometime in the first quarter of 2008. Currently the three States could be described as being in a 'state of readiness for SESP', with important centralised training⁹ having taken place in most components.¹⁰ Therefore capacity for SESP is being built, drawing on technical papers produced during 2006-2007.

Brief notes and comments on the OVIs for Output 3 are provided below:

OVI 3.1 Technical papers and costed work plans:

24 technical papers completed

OVI 3.2 World Bank approval for SESP credit:

CUBE provided support for many of the pre-appraisal and appraisal visits and activities in advance of publication of the Project Appraisal Document (PAD) and thereby approval for SESP credit

OVI 3.3 Pre-effectiveness activities:

PSUs trained and active in SESP pre-effectiveness activities, including IT skills, understanding and application of WB procurement and financial methodology, and the successful drafting letters of no objection

OVI 3.4 SESP M&E Framework:

Draft M&E Framework developed in April 2007 to be finalised by October 2007.

OVI 3.5 SESP Implementation following Credit Effectiveness:

Credit effectiveness is unlikely to take place until 2008. However in the States many pre-effectiveness activities are under way and States should be ready for the ensuring year. Some activities, e.g. the planned architecture-design exercise are incomplete and it is to be hoped that this does not adversely affect the delivery infrastructure improvements. The two CUBE-delivered components, Inspectorate Reform and Capacity Development, are under way, although there are some misunderstandings at State level that this is the case. See Footnotes 9 and 10. The capacity building sub-component includes ongoing work on the ESA and communications strategy, but the HR element of the sub-component has still to be started. CUBE has assured that this will be undertaken in the coming year.

2.2.4 Overall project outputs score

Outputs general score: 2 (likely to be largely achieved by EOP)

Provided the present impetus is maintained, enhanced capacity for UBE (as described in the project log frame) should be largely achieved. However this

⁹ Training has taken place most effectively in the SMOE-based Project Support Units (PSU) where staff express enthusiasm for their enhanced abilities. The PSU is staffed by desk officers from SMOEs and SUBEB, with the latter frequently in the 'assistant lead' positions. Training has not yet reached the LGEA level at the time of writing. Manuals have been prepared for the SBMCs and textbook distribution but training of trainers in how to use and apply them is yet to take place.

¹⁰ The four components in which PSU and SESP Lead Persons and Deputy Lead Persons have been appointed and where training has taken place are as follows: Project Management Procedures (Procurement and Finance), EMIS, Monitoring and Evaluation and Textbooks.

assessment may be affected by possible changes in National and State policy directions following the election and as policy changes become embedded.

2.3 CUBE finances

2.3.1 **DFID disbursement to TAMC:** The terms under which DFID disburses to TAMC were not available to the OPR team. However, since no issues were raised on this matter (and none appear in reports), it is assumed that timely disbursement takes place. During 2006/07, DFID raised its funding commitment to CUBE from £10 997 000 (2006) to £15 289 565 (2007), an increase of 39%.

2.3.2 **CUBE disbursement:** Table 2.1 (next page) shows actual project expenditures to July 2007, the balance remaining until EOP (August 2008) and the total projected expenditures over the life of the project.

In Table 2.1 it can be seen that by July 2007, £10.646 million (69.6%) of the £15.290 million available to the project had been disbursed, leaving some £4.644 million (30.4%) to be spent in the final year. Although considerable expenditure on training and workshops is anticipated in the year ahead, the OPR team wonders whether full disbursement by project end will be achieved.

Table 2.1: CUBE Expenditure (Actual to date and Project lifetime)

	Category	Actual spend 08/03 to 07/07		Balance 08/07 to 08/08		Total	
		£'000	%	£'000	£'000	%	
A: Fees							
1	Long term	2,495	23.4%	1,722	4,217	27.6%	
2	Short term	1,934	18.2%	911	2,845	18.6%	
3	TAMC management	1,843	17.3%	1,188	3,031	19.8%	
Sub-total (A)		6,272	58.9%	3,821	10,094	66.0%	
B: Reimbursables							
4	Fares	213	2.0%	167	381	2.5%	
5	Subsistence	484	4.5%	268	752	4.9%	
6	Equipment/vehicles	901	8.5%	-136	765	5.0%	
7	Training/workshops	1,514	14.2%	-191	1,323	8.7%	
8	Sector studies	34	0.3%	316	350	2.3%	
9	Accommodation	1,203	11.3%	398	1,601	10.5%	
10	Procurement	24	0.2%	0	24	0.2%	
Sub-total (B)		4,373	41.1%	823	5,196	34.0%	
Total (A + B)		10,646	100%	4,644	15,290	100%	

- Notes:** (1) Percentages relate to the relevant (A+B) totals; e.g. 23.4% of the £10.646 million spent to date has met the charge-out costs of long-term project consultants (and so on)
- (2) There may be rounding errors
- (3) TAMC can provide more detailed data that will unpack much of the above account. For example, based on the information available to the OPR team, it is not clear whether 'Accommodation' is solely accommodation for training/workshops, or for TA and management, or both.
- (4) There may be some errors in the Table 2.1. For example, there are omissions in the financial statement for April to June 07 (e.g. there are no charge-out costs for the

EMIS specialist or for the SEPA). This implies that the spend might actually be slightly greater than that shown above and that the accounts need careful scrutiny.

- 2.3.3 **Value for money:** To the OPR team it appears that a considerable amount of the project resource is devoted to project management. The charge-out costs that underpin line No 3 in Table 2 appear not only excessive (e.g. £172,332 p.a. for the UK-appointed Project Administrator; £65,364 p.a. for the Nigeria-appointed Resource Manager) but disproportionate to those of the long term consultants in line No 1. (e.g., comparatively speaking, 'only' £126,720 p.a. for the UK-appointed Project Manager; £47,520 for the Nigeria-appointed technical officers).

We fully understand and accept that a project as diverse and as 'people-intense' as CUBE requires expert efficient project management and that this is a drain on resources (and we have already commended the quality of the management). However, we would imagine that the overall project manager would/should command a higher charge-out rate than the project administrator. We understand of course that charge-out figures cover a raft of costs (such as salary, accommodation, fares, transport, office rent, running costs, tools of the trade), so we were surprised to find that items such as general office costs, running costs, BC office rent Abuja, are also listed under 'miscellaneous reimbursables' (amounting to £528,154 for FY Apr 06 to March 07 alone)¹¹.

The issue of project and CUBE office management was raised at an open meeting with TAMC, where it was reported that office managers were essential to the project and that the current arrangements were the outcome of a DFID-TAMC agreement. The OPR team accepts this but advises that to ensure that all concerned (British taxpayers, Nigerian children) get value for money, any such future agreements should be carefully costed and confirmation obtained that some items are not double counted.

2.4 CUBE impact and issues

a) FGN level

Paragraphs 2.4.1 to 2.4.3 contain brief accounts of observations arising out of FGN level visits. These observations inform the recommendations in Section 4 of the report.

- 2.4.1 **Federal Ministry of Education:** CUBE had considerable impact in the Federal Ministry of Education (FMoE), when, during late 2006 and early 2007, it assisted the development of the 10-year FMoE Education Strategic Plan. Simultaneously, CUBE assisted the development of reform proposals for national education, including the production of a national Reform Strategy for education. The reform proposals were completed by the time of the election and are currently awaiting consideration from the incoming Minister of

¹¹ CUBE (March 2007): 2006-07 Financial Statement to DFID

Education. It hardly needs to be stated that the positive impact of CUBE in this component could be undermined if the Minister takes serious issue with the reform agenda.

- 2.4.2 **Planning Directorate FMoE:** Included in the Reform Strategy were reforms to the planning department of FMoE. These included rationalising the Education Data Bank (EDB) department within the Statistics unit and the relocation of the Federal Inspectorate Services (FIS) as a more independent unit within the UBEC umbrella. Whereas the former change seems to have been embraced and EDB staff reshuffles have taken place, it was evident at the time of the OPR that FIS is unlikely to move to UBEC. Although there was broad satisfaction with the inputs from TA in EDB, there are fears regarding sustainability and worries about whether capacity has really been built (Director, PRS).
- 2.4.3 **Statistics Department:** The Statistics Department falls under the Planning Directorate and is a rationalisation of the previous Statistics and EDB/NEMIS sections. Despite acknowledgement of CUBE assistance in developing capacity for the production of statistics and data collection, there is still a need for capacity building and training packages for NEMIS staff on software development and data processing. Assistance for the development of a national EMIS at Federal and States level has been a significant achievement of CUBE. However, despite considerable progress (Education Statistics 2004/05 published, 2005/06 at page proof stage, data collection format developed), there are sustainability issues surrounding the possibility that there may actually be no strong institutional desire or ministerial impetus for an accurate and up-to-date EMIS. Evidence of this is demonstrated in the lack of budgetary allocations (or, if allocated, the absence of fund release) for EMIS, e.g. no FME money set aside for the publication of the 2005/06 EMIS, dysfunctional internet services because of non-payment of bills, no money set aside for virus protection, intermittent power supply. The present directorate has visionary, if somewhat unrealistic, hopes for NEMIS development and statistics training. Hitherto, CUBE has been able to help to bring about some of the EDB plans and it is clear that in the year ahead (and under ESSPIN to come there needs to be a continuation of technical support as well as support for software development. However, for support to be more effective, it may be necessary to review how this is to function in the longer term, especially in relation to institutional demand for EMIS and, in particular, the information flow to and from all the States of the Federation.
- 2.4.4 **Federal Inspectorate Services (FIS):** The FIS has wide national coverage: over 1,300 staff and representation in every State. Inspection manuals at primary and secondary level were published in 2007 using MDG funds, and inspection instruments are currently being developed. There is a national training programme under development with 200 inspectors to act as trainers of trainers with an expected outreach to 1,000 inspectors. The current Acting Director

expressed concern that although inspection instruments are under consideration, there are as yet no plans to assist capacity in providing meaningful feedback of inspection reports to SUBEBs, LGEAs and schools and from States and Zones to the central office.. Although there has been recent contact with the CUBE SEPA, there appears as yet to be no formal proposal or plans for capacity building assistance in these areas. The Director expressed the need for capacity building within the FIS.

- 2.4.5 **UBEC:** The Executive Secretary of UBEC had just been appointed at the time of the OPR. Discussions with one of the UBEC Directors indicated that the proposal for FIS to link with UBEC was not welcomed and indeed there was no legal basis for such a link. There were evident concerns that the larger FIS (approx 1300 staff) might swamp the relatively small UBEC (300 personnel).

There was evidence of contact with CUBE (e.g. letters and visits from the SEPA), but there had been no actual capacity-building intervention within the last year. The kind of support that CUBE might provide would be to strengthen capacity for, in order of priority, the development of (1) a communications strategy, (2) monitoring and evaluation skills, including the development of realistic minimum national standards (MNS) and their link to resource allocation and quality benchmarks, (3) general management skills in the zonal and State offices of UBEC and in the SUBEBs, (4) teacher development (especially head teacher development). It was clear that more support from CUBE would be welcomed and is actually expected: an office has been identified for the SEPA, a CUBE-committee has been formed with representatives from all of the main UBEC departments and links and communications have been established with the SEPA. As advisor for education policy, the SEPA has an important role to play. However, so far as the OPR team could ascertain, it appears that the SEPA is not based within UBEC (as was originally intended and where he could have considerable impact on 'policy into practice'). The role and location of the SEPA is in need of clarification. The feeling within UBEC was that much could be done to strengthen UBEC capacity within the remaining year of the project, e.g. the UBEC central office could be trained to cascade CUBE methodologies to the Zonal and State offices.

b) States level

Paragraphs 2.4.6 – 2.4.9 discuss issues arising from visits to the selected States. Discussion has been arranged as follows: SMOEs/PSUs; SUBEBs/LGEAs/schools; CUBE offices; non-SESP support for UBE. This section should be read in conjunction with Annexes D and E.

- 2.4.6 **SMoEs and PSUs:** The 'arrival' in 2006 in the selected SMOEs of the revised CUBE project, the promise of SESP and the establishment of SMOE-based SESP Project Support Units (PSU) have all served to revitalise the SMOEs. Each selected SMOE has, located within it, an established PSU, comprising four SMOE directors (a coordinator and

officers for procurement, finance, and monitoring and evaluation) who combine PSU duties with their normal directorate responsibilities. (One SESP PSU member in Kano is not from another State government body, but broadly speaking PSU members are from the SMOE.) Whereas this would appear to be a sustainable model, it was noted by the PS in at least one ministry that at times this makes undue demands on staff. Each PSU supports the Lead Persons (LP) and Deputy Lead Persons (DLP) in implementing the SESP. LPs and DLPs are drawn from the SMOEs and from the SUBEBs with responsibilities for implementation of SESP components: School Development Scheme, Teacher Development, Infrastructure, Textbooks, EMIS, Capacity Development, and Inspectorate. All LPs and DLPs considered that their capacity and professionalism had been enhanced under CUBE and the team was struck by their general enthusiasm for the project (and for the forthcoming SESP). However, the following were consistently observed:

a) Despite joint SMOE-SUBEB discussion during the selection process, most of the LPs were drawn from the SMOEs, with the DLPs from the SUBEBs. This created some resentment with some SUBEBs (e.g. Kwara; see Annex D); in other cases the LP/DLP distinction was largely ignored with the person with the greatest expertise (often the SUBEB officer) taking the *de facto* lead.

b) SUBEB knowledge of and involvement in the CUBE-SESP was generally slight (especially in Kano and Kwara). In some cases this was because of the non- (or very recent) appointment of SUBEB chairpersons and in all cases it was also a consequence of very low cross-pollination of ideas across SUBEB directorates (who often appeared to be keepers rather than sharers of knowledge and ideas).

c) In two important delivery areas, *Capacity Building* and *Inspection*, the LPs and DLPs have yet to be trained. TAMC is aware of this issue and is taking steps to appoint appropriate personnel. Training needs to be defined and delivered alongside the results of policy studies to ensure coherence, but there is a reasonable concern that this work needs to be properly addressed in good time before the SESP launch (now most probably in the early months of 2008).¹²

d) Despite the previously-mentioned progress made by CUBE over the past year, a number of activities remain to be completed in accordance with State plans, for example:

- some technical papers and TORs are yet to be finalised;
- some training materials have yet to be drafted and circulated for comment;
- some training of TOTs is yet to take place (this cannot be contracted until the credit is in place);
- some studies (e.g. baseline study) have not yet reached 2nd draft stage;

¹² Specific plans for the implementation of these two components are as yet unclear – in particular: plans for the *full period* of SESP (not just the remaining year of CUBE) as written into the States' work plans.

- financial management national adviser (Kano) still to be recruited (Kano SG access to WB funds a constraint);
- preliminary architectural design and environmental survey work for the infrastructure sub-component of SESP¹³.

A fifth issue deserves special mention:

e) All States are in the process of producing their 2nd SEEDS documents. It is important that these documents are in broad agreement with the aims and targets of the SMoE Education Strategic Plans (ESP). It is important therefore that CUBE ensures that the SMoEs speak to the MoFs (or relevant ministries or Governor's Office) that produces the SEEDS document and/or State Road Map¹⁴. DFID's Northern Nigeria office should play a key role in ensuring consistency of ESPs with other State Government policy documents, using both its access to high-level decision makers and its operational Ministry contacts. SLGP in Kano may be able to help CUBE forge links with Kano State's Ministries of Finance and Planning and Budgeting.

2.4.7 **SUBEBs/LGEAs/Schools:** With the SESP launch not yet under way, nor its related credit effective, and the communications strategy still under development, it is not surprising that there are varying levels of awareness of CUBE and SESP, especially at the LGEA and school levels.

a) Although the location of CUBE and SESP within the SMoEs is well understood by the OPR team and reflects the institutional arrangements agreed by States and WB for the SESP, it is nevertheless a matter of concern that the SUBEBs have not been as much involved in the SESP process as they could or should have been¹⁵. The SUBEBs already possess expertise and experience in in-State procurement and mobilisation of significant government funds in the very areas that SESP wishes to assist. Moreover, they, together with UBEC at the centre, have a remit for UBE (not the SMoEs).

b) Although it transpired that sensitisation of the LGEAs had taken place, its impact in LGEAs varied from low in Kano to high in Kwara. (It should be noted that the team was only able to visit one LGEA in Kano, where the Education Secretary was recently appointed, so this may not be representative of the Kano SESP LGEAs as a whole.) This is not too surprising (indeed a case could be made that sensitisation should come much nearer the time of delivery – not a year in advance). The LGEAs have a very low skill base and it is

¹³ There is a risk that that further delays in essential A&E work may delay the construction of classrooms in 98 schools in the selected States by about 1 year.

¹⁴ The Kano State Road Map was produced independently of the ESP. It contains priorities and models for education that are not reflected in the ESP. See Annex D.

¹⁵ The OPR team appreciates that some newly-appointed SUBEB chairpersons and directors may not have been appraised of CUBE-SESP issues at the time of the review. Nevertheless it was evident to the team in all SUBEBs that at Director level there was considerable vagueness about CUBE/SESP.

difficult to see that CUBE can positively affect this in the year ahead. The main procurement and delivery for SESP is likely to be at the SMOE (and possibly SUBEB) level. Where there was evident knowledge and expectation of SESP (in Kwara and to some extent Kaduna), there was a sense of frustration that nothing appeared to be happening yet.

c) As expected (and as appropriate) there was little knowledge of CUBE-SESP at schools level. The schools selected for SESP benefits were large urban schools (some double shift). However it was noted that some schools in Kano already had on-going community and SUBEB infrastructure projects under way (see Annex E). This raises questions about the efficacy and pro-poor fairness of school selection, or about State coordination of infrastructure development under different planning and funding regimes, or both.

d) Following the establishment of a legal framework at Federal and State levels, the formation of School-Based Management Committees (SBMC) has been met with considerable enthusiasm among communities. It is an opportune time for capacity strengthening in the SBMCs, and for the development of School Development Schemes (SDS) that involve the management of school resources. It is imperative that CUBE build on the initiative that was taken by government in this respect (and encourage Federal and State governments to do likewise).

2.4.8 **CUBE Offices:** CUBE offices typically contained a mix of TA (an international STL, and national TAs for Procurement, School Development and Teacher Development) and support personnel (Project Officer, assistant Project Officer, Drivers). The CUBE offices were located in the SMOEs, though in the case of Kwara, the CUBE office (and the SESP/PSU office) was located in a very modern adjunct of the SMOE (the State Library Board) not in the main ministry building. At a professional level, these offices are providing a strong capacity building focus for the work of the PSU and are central to the work of CUBE in the selected States. However, the following were noted:

a) In some cases, national TA had only very recently been appointed (and in one case was still outstanding). This situation may reflect the original intention to contract TA under the WB credit, with CUBE plugging the gap caused by delays to credit effectiveness.

b) In Kaduna State, the PS expressed concern over the numerous STLs who had come and gone within the year and that SMOE requests in this regard had been overlooked. This had not only created continuity problems for CUBE-SESP, but appeared to have created some dissatisfaction with the process.

c) It was also pointed out in at least one SMOE (and was quite obvious to casual inspection) that the facilities available to the CUBE office (computers, printers, internet connectivity, electricity supply, photocopying, drinking water cooler) far exceeded those available to senior SMOE staff, including most PSU members. This placed the

SMoEs on an uneven footing with CUBE colleagues.

d) Whereas it is reasonable and proper for CUBE's professional officers (STL, TAs) to enjoy good working conditions within the SMoEs, it may give the wrong message to see office administrators and drivers enjoying the same facilities. There is a danger that the current CUBE offices (and in some cases PSUs) are becoming reminiscent of those World-Bank style PIUs from 'the bad old days'! This comment could equally be extended to the project vehicles, which are painted up as 'CUBE' (and display prominent 'British Council' stickers), with little visible reference to the SMoEs or to government. At this late stage in the project, the OPR team will not make any recommendation on this issue¹⁶. However, this is something that should be kept in mind during the design of the support component of ESSPIN.

- 2.4.9 **Non-SESP support for UBE:** It was evident to the OPR team that CUBE is working flat out to support activities leading up to the launch of SESP, and beyond. However, it is equally clear that there are many UBE components that SESP does not cover, very noticeably support to Islamiyyah, Qur'anic and Tsangaya Education (IQTE) and to nomadic education. Nomadic education is of significance in all States (and was supported by DFID about a decade ago). IQTE covers huge numbers of children, particularly in northern States and Islamiyyah schools in particular act as a very important bridge between the secular curriculum and the religious education tradition.
- 2.4.10 We hope that over the remainder of the project and as SESP demands lessen, CUBE is able to balance its support for SESP preparation and implementation, with support to other, non-SESP government priorities for UBE. There is a key role for CUBE STLs (supported by DFID's Kano office) in helping States understand, own and use the analysis and data being produced by IDPs and closing an apparently widening "knowledge gap". In this respect, the work now underway to develop and cost the 10 Year Education Sector Plans, is a key priority for the year ahead. However, where CUBE capacity exists, areas such as the two outlined above would be worthy of further study, perhaps at feasibility level at this stage.

¹⁶ The OPR team assumes that the present situation has been negotiated and agreed (and will broadly remain in place) until EOP next year. The team also recognises that professional long term staff are unlikely to wish to work in States (or anywhere else) where there is no access to basic tools of the trade. This situation may be avoided in future if MOUs take these points into consideration (e.g. States to ensure functioning offices for project *and* senior States staff).

3 RISKS AND SUSTAINABILITY

3.1 Risks and threats

3.1.1 **Risks 2006:** Table 3.1 shows the risks identified in the July 2006 OPR. Brief comments on the current status of these risks are provided.

Table 3.1: Risks 2006

	Risks/Threats (July 2006)	Comments (1 October 2007)
1.	<i>Inadequate commitment of the new Government to implement the revised support to UBE (through the SESP modality).</i>	This remains a risk and is carried forward
2.	<i>Lack of compliance to the UBE Act, adversely affecting UBE/SESP implementation at State, LGEA and School levels</i>	All key stakeholders are aware of and comply with the Act
3.	<i>Low stakeholder commitment to key elements of the project, for example institutional reform (including planning, management and monitoring of UBE); financial reform, HIV&AIDS initiatives</i>	Commitment is evident in most respects
4.	<i>Ineffective coordination between stakeholders</i>	Applies at SMoE- SUBEB level; a modified version of this risk is carried forward (also see 11 below)
5.	<i>Patronage may distort the selection of national TA and the identification of and support to the target groups, notably the LGAs, leading to reduced effectiveness of TA and lack of equity in the allocation of resources.</i>	Still a risk – carried forward
6.	<i>Slow development and integration into the planning process of EMIS at State level will adversely affect SESP implementation</i>	Still a risk. There appears to be little real institutional demand for EMIS (eg no recurrent budget released for EMIS related activities)
7.	<i>Some States will not meet the requirements needed to secure and mobilise the IDA Credit</i>	CUBE-TAMC appears mostly to have eliminated this risk (but Kano still facing bureaucratic hurdles)
8.	<i>Difficulties in obtaining a suitable blend of Technical Assistance with adequate knowledge and experience of World Bank and Government of Nigeria proc</i>	TA appear to be suitable. This risk largely eliminated by TAMC
9.	<i>The PCUs may disempower SMoEs if not operated as intended</i>	SESP PSUs are based within SMoEs, reducing this risk
10.	<i>Lack of financing of SESP components (e.g. recurrent costs of EMIS) from both the Federal and State Governments will threaten sustainability</i>	Still a risk (see 6 above)
11.	<i>SMoE and SUBEB resistance to procurement reform and transparency, especially in relation to infrastructure and textbooks adversely affects project implementation</i>	Resistance is not apparent; however SUBEBs need to be carried along with the reform process
12.	<i>Reluctance of Commissioners and key State, SMoE, and SUBEB officials to attend important SESP conferences at international venues (e.g. in Washington, London)</i>	Not a risk

Many of last year's risks have eliminated by the passage of time and by steps taken by CUBE-TAMC. Some risks remain, however, and have been carried forward.

3.1.2 **Project risks/threats as at 1 October 2007** are given below:

- [1] *Incoming FGN and Minister of Education are unable to endorse some or all of the CUBE components (e.g. support to the Education Reform Programme, the new role of FIS)*
Highly likely, but adverse impact can be managed provided DFID and CUBE are able to respond to new directions *[high probability, high impact]*
- [2] *Insufficient involvement of UBEC and SUBEBs in the CUBE-SESP process and, by extension, UBE roll out*
Existing tensions between policy makers and implementers, if not taken into account, will adversely affect sustainability *[medium probability, high impact]*
- [3] *SMEs and SUBEBs resist, or are unable to implement, procurement reforms, especially in relation to infrastructure, textbooks, professional training and school grant scheme*
The World Bank requires that their procurement procedures are followed *[low probability, high impact]*
- [4] *Mismatch between State ESP and State SEEDS/Road Map*
Possible in some States (e.g. Kano) but can be managed if DFID and CUBE are proactive *[low probability, low impact]*
- [5] *Tensions within DFID-WB partnership*
Success of CUBE is dependent on productive working relationships between DFID-TAMC and the World Bank *[medium probability, medium impact]*
- [6] *Patronage has distorted the selection of national TA in some cases and the identification of and support to target groups (LGEAs, schools) leading to reduced effectiveness of TA and lack of equity in the allocation of resources* *[medium probability, medium impact]*
- [7] *Training in the use of EMIS will not take place in time and/or will not be sufficiently effective to inform planning and decision-making at Federal and State levels* *[medium probability, medium impact]*
- [8] *Lack of government financing of SESP components (e.g. recurrent costs of EMIS) at both Federal and State levels will threaten EMIS sustainability* [Impact rated as low since it is likely that medium term support will continue from CUBE and, subsequently, ESSPIN] *[medium probability, low impact]*
- [9] **Super risk:** *FGN and State UBE programmes are not operationalised effectively and efficiently* *[medium probability, high impact]*

3.1.3 **Overall project risk status:** Fig. 3.1 is the probability-impact matrix for the project. Since Fig. 3.1 contains more than two risks in the red (dark) zone, the project risk assessment is **HIGH**.

Fig. 3.1: Probability/impact matrix

Impact ↑	High	[3]	[2], [9]	[1]
	Medium		[5], [6], [7]	
	Low	[4]	[8]	
		Low	Medium	High
		Probability →		

3.2 Sustainability

3.2.1 **Overview:** There are a number of issues that raise concerns about the sustainability of the project. Many issues link to the question of whether there is sufficient institutional demand for the CUBE initiatives that will ensure the use of government resources after project end. Another set of issues involve the possible need for CUBE (and its successor) to consider more strategic directions than hitherto. As sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 will show, these two sets of issues are interlinked.

3.2.2 **Institutional demand for change:** Consider the following examples (by no means exhaustive):

a) EMIS issues¹⁷: There is a widespread view among many stakeholders that the improvements in EMIS (NEMIS and State EMIS) have been a success story of CUBE. The OPR team shares this view. See Annex C. Despite this, there appears to be very little government buy-in when it comes to direct support for EMIS [E.g. Statistics for 2004-05, prepared with CUBE assistance were printed by USAID, not government; Statistics for 2005-6 prepared and at camera-ready stage with CUBE assistance but no government funding available for printing; bills not paid for essential internet connection; stand-by generator provided by CUBE – but frequently waiting for government funding for fuel and maintenance]. This consistent non-support from government (at all levels) raises questions of whether the top-level Federal and the State authorities really require or indeed understand the benefits that ensue from a

¹⁷ Please read this section in conjunction with Annex C.

sound EMIS, whether they will sustain what has been achieved after project end., and whether both Federal and State education leaders will support EMIS in future in the non-selected States. To counteract this, DFID may wish to consider the extent to which it is worth continuing to provide high-levels of support for EMIS without there being some conditionality returns on the part of government.

b) Inspection issues: National plans for school inspection essentially amount to 'more of the same' and the continuation of inspection bodies in apparent competition with each other (each of the following institutions have their own inspection teams: FIS, UBEC, UBEC Zonal Offices, SUBEBs, SMOEs, LGEAs and many more besides: for example, Kano State has 11 different inspection teams in operation). Typically some schools could be inspected many times in a short period, while others might simply fall between stones due to lack of overall coordination. Although Minimum National Standards (MNS) and Education Indicators are beginning to be identified (important embryonic outcomes from EMIS outputs), there is no widespread agreement on them and they are not referred to by inspection teams. Thus, inspection teams have no yardstick against which to measure education standards, nor are they in a position to feed back to schools or to feed forward to State and Federal planners. Inspection instruments have been drafted, but they are unwieldy, use out-moded methodologies, do not link to EMIS and make no mention of MNS or education indicators. This calls into question the value of the whole system of inspection. A central issue for CUBE (and ESSPIN to come) will be to determine appropriate forms of support that address the fragmented nature of school inspection, and the poor quality of inspection instruments and protocols.

c) SMBC: In keeping with the education law, governments have established SMBCs nationwide within the last year. So far, so good. However, institution demand for SBMCs is questionable since there has been minimal follow-up (e.g. no training in roles and responsibilities in relation to PTAs, in resource management and school-development planning, no provision of school bank accounts).

3.2.3 **Strategic thinking for sustainability:** Whereas CUBE is currently meeting most of its purpose outputs, it may be time for some strategic changes in direction if project benefits are to be sustained¹⁸. In addition to the previously mentioned sub-components on capacity-strengthening and inspection, the following are worthy of consideration:

a) EMIS: Gains in EMIS may be evaporated unless there are some strategic changes. The current top-down strategy with information flows originating at the top, flowing to the periphery, then back up

¹⁸ If CUBE is unable to do this within its current TORs then these ideas should be considered by the CUBE-successor, ESSPIN.

again (where it sits unprinted) is unwieldy and unsustainable (it is not realistic for data in a country as large as Nigeria to be entered in one location). The flow has to be reversed: *Schools* → *LGEAs* → *SUBEBS* → *SMEs* → *FME*, where the data is collected for possible utilisation at each level before onward and upward transmission. This will require more manageable school data/mapping instruments than obtain at present, data processing equipment, stable internet connections and electricity supply, and capacity building at all levels. It should operate in all States (with perhaps the current selected States as pilots) and there must be State and FGN buy-in (see 3.2.1a above). Greater government support should be a condition of further support for EMIS, if this is to be sustainable.

b) SUBEB support: Hitherto, in its past and previous incarnations, CUBE has focussed on support to State SMEs. Given the underpinning emphasis on whole sector planning, this was a correct strategic thrust. However, now that State ESPs are in place (and soon to be costed), the emphasis during the period of SESP will be on delivery of certain aspects of UBE as spelled out in the PAD.. It is self-evident that for UBE interventions to be successful, the SUBEBs must be brought fully on board, with many of the benefits. This will require a modification of the present support strategy: support for the SMEs *and* for the SUBEBs. There are potentially huge benefits in terms of UBE development and post-project sustainability, since, already, the SUBEBs are the main governmental UBE delivery agents. The correct strategy for DFID-CUBE and the World Bank is to recognise this as a reality, to build on and improve present practices and to strengthen the institutional arrangements of the SUBEBs. However, this needs to be achieved without loss to the support and enthusiasm generated in the SMEs.

4 RECOMMENDATIONS AND WAY AHEAD

4.1 Recommendations

4.1.1 Table 4.1 makes explicit the recommendations arising from this report (and provides back references to the relevant paragraphs). The recommendations take account of the risks, threats and sustainability issues identified in the previous section, and discussions between senior DFID and World Bank personnel and the OPR team. These recommendations should form the basis of discussions between Federal and State governments, DFID and TAMC and it will be noted that the 'who' column reinforces the need for government agencies to be involved.

Table 4.1 Recommendations

Recommendations	Notes [Paragraph reference numbers in brackets.]	Who
Overarching		
1 Brief incoming Minister of Education on CUBE and determine whether modifications are required to address new Government policy directions	It is imperative that DFID-CUBE build on previous capacity gains in FME without prejudice to the policy thrust of the new Minister [2.4.1]	FMoE, DFID- TAMC
2 Ensure that early dialogue takes place between DFID and WB to clarify roles and relations in the education sector with respect to the CPS (on the wider front), and, in the medium term, SESP and the forthcoming ESSPIN	Clearer understanding needs to be obtained between these two key development partners so as not jeopardise project gains – now and/or later [1.1.6]	DFID-WB
CUBE specific		
3 Modify the project logframe in line with the CUBE Management Roadmap	Do this immediately. Use expert help if necessary, but do it soon [1.1.3, 1.3.3, 2.1.4, 2.1.5]	DFID- TAMC
4 Ensure that the UBEC-SUBEB-LGEA axis is much more involved in the SESP process	This is of fundamental importance. It will require greater focus by CUBE and SESP (if not immediately, then certainly when ESSPIN comes on board – but delay is to be avoided) [2.4.5, 2.4.6, 2.4.7, 3.2.3]	UBEC, SUBEBs SMoEs TAMC- DFID-WB
5 Finalise and release PER reports for use in costing exercises	These four are interlinked. CUBE to assist in building capacity and understanding towards the development of a financial strategy for UBE - one that links to the Budget Cycle and is known, understood, put into operation in Federal and State MoFs and MoEs and reflected in SEEDs and other State documents. Involvement of FMoE, SMoEs, SUBEBs, LGEAs is imperative. DFID's Kano office can play a key role in ensuring complementarity of policy instruments. SLGP can advise on links between Kano SMoE and State Ministry of Finance.	FMoE SMoEs SUBEBs LGEAs TAMC DFID-WB
6 Revise and cost State ESPs and ESOPs in a timely manner		
7 Follow up publication of revised, realistic, costed ESP/ESOP by appropriate capacity building measures (e.g. in linking costing models to planning, prioritisation and to the		

<p>budgetary process) in the States at senior management, planning and operational levels</p>	<p>[2.2.3, 2.4.6]</p>	
<p>8 Ensure that there is alignment between the revised State ESPs and the State SEEDS/Road Map papers, including the strengthening of links with Ministries of Finance and Budgeting</p>		
<p>9 Provide support to EDB to consolidate EMIS activities in as many States as possible during 2007-08 (but do not attempt to introduce new concepts, software and hardware before the present models have been universalised and internalised)</p>	<p>Institutional demand for and commitment to EMIS needs to be in place before further serious inputs are made. Emphasis on the dissemination and use of EMIS-generated information is crucial in building this demand. Likewise there is a need for a change in strategic direction (bottom-up instead of top-down) in future EMIS interventions. It might be advisable to undertake a study, targeted at the consideration of EMIS directions and strategies, post 2008. [2.4.2, 2.4.3, 3.2.2, 3.2.3]</p>	<p>SMoEs, SUBEBs, TAMC</p>
<p>10 Provide support to FIS in the revision of more streamlined user-friendly inspection instruments and feedback systems</p>	<p>These link to the previously-mentioned need for inspectorate reforms and, importantly, 'making use of EMIS' (MNS and Education Indicators) and will most probably require studies and expert TA. Eliminate any possibility of a knowledge gap developing between the studies and the use that Federal and State systems can put them to [2.4.4, 3.2.2]</p>	<p>FMoE UBEC? TAMC</p>
<p>11 Provide support for the development and publication of education sector indicators and MNS</p>		
<p>12 Finalise and implement communications strategy immediately (UBEC and the States)</p>	<p>There is an urgent need for this at all levels (especially, UBEC, SUBEBs, LGEAs and communities, in order to get the 'UBE message' across [2.2.3, 2.4.5]</p>	<p>TAMC</p>
<p>13 Clarify the role of the SEPA, revising job description and TORs if necessary</p>	<p>The SEPA should be located within UBEC. Beyond that, the TA should play a clear policy advisory role, particularly in the establishment and use of MNS and the development of a new strategic vision at 'the centre' as well as for the project as a whole (e.g. by increasing UBEC/SUBEB involvement). Currently the strategic dimension appears to be missing (or is poorly articulated). [2.4.5]</p>	<p>DFID-WB-TAMC in discussion with FMoE UBEC</p>
<p>14 Prioritise inputs at LGEA level that will improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the SBMCs</p>	<p>Perhaps the strategy for LGEA capacity enhancement needs to be revisited at the same time. [2.4.7, 3.2.2]</p>	<p>TAMC</p>
<p>15 Provide training for LPs and DLPs in the Inspectorate Reform, Capacity Development components of</p>	<p>These important areas need to be addressed as part of a successful SESP take-off during 2007 and 2008. [2.2.3, 2.4.6]</p>	<p>TAMC</p>

SESP as a matter of urgency			
16	Ensure STILs provide sufficient support to States to understand, own and apply results of 10-year planning process (related to recommendations 5,6,7)	Separately contracted CUBE TA will deliver technical aspects of the ESPs, but STLs can play a key part in ensuring States own and use the results. [2.4.10]	TAMC DFID-WB
17	Identify and provide support for non-SESP pro-UBE capacity building measures (within CUBE capacity constraints)	There are CUBE capacity issues here (already reported as going 'flat-out' on SESP-support activities). However, it appears that significant UBE-related areas (e.g. IQTE, nomads) have not been included within SESP. [2.4.9]	SUBEBs SMoE TAMC

4.2 Post OPR action plan

4.2.1 Table 4.2 contains a proposed sequence for post OPR action. This table should be discussed, amended where necessary and put into operation (alongside other ongoing CUBE activities which of course must continue). Particular note should be taken of responsibilities, indicative outputs, start dates and target dates.

Table 4.2: Post OPR Action Plan

Priority Start	Action	Who, Outputs, Targets
1 8 Oct 07	Amend logframe outputs immediately so that they accurately inform the remaining 11 months of CUBE and are measurable for the next OPR	<i>TAMC with DFID oversight: Amended LF by 12 Oct 2007</i>
2 ASAP	Brief incoming Minister of Education on CUBE and determine whether modifications are required to address new Government policy directions	<i>DFID with TAMC</i>
3 Immediately	Review the role and TORs for the SEPA, ensuring a closer institutional link with Federal institutions (probably UBEC) with a possible responsibility for ensuring greater SUBEBs interaction with CUBE-SESP	<i>TAMC with DFID-WB oversight TORs by 31 October</i>
4 Immediately	Complete and inaugurate the Communications strategy and Federal and State levels.	<i>TAMC (with the assistance of the PR expertise currently in UNICEF Field Office D)</i>
5 now and ongoing	Release PER reports and use them to : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare costed ESP and ESOP • Provide appropriate capacity building measures for senior and middle management in the development of costing models that link the costed ESP to UBE planning, prioritisation and the annual budget cycle • Ensure that State and LGA budgets work plans are realistic, timed and costed in line with the revised ESP/ESOP • Establish M&E systems that link to the annual work plans 	<i>DFID-WB and TAMC Costed 2006 ESPs by 12/07 and ESOPs by 12/07 Costed, revised ESPs by 03/08 Senior planners trained by 03/08 ESOP informs the 2009 budget 2009 SESP work plans informed by ESOP</i>

<p>6 Nov 07</p>	<p>Select and commission studies based on Recommendations 10 and 11.</p>	<p><i>TORs for Studies by mid October Studies complete before end December 2007</i></p>
<p>7 Ongoing to EOP</p>	<p>Complete training of trainers for a) SBMCs, b) Headteachers, c) Teachers, b) c) Inspectors by EOP Ensure SMBCs are able to produce robust School Development Schemes</p>	<p><i>All trainers of trainers for SBMCs, head teachers and teachers in SESP supported schools are trained 21 Trained inspectors (7/State)</i></p>

4.2 Eleven lessons for ESSPIN

The following are offered for consideration:

- 4.3.1 **Be strategic:** Adopt a strategic approach to sector development with work-planning linked to the budgetary cycle (and in due course a MTEF). Extend strategic considerations to EMIS and sector monitoring, with greater emphasis on appropriate information flows, costed plans, the use of statistics, MNS and education indicators.
- 4.3.2 **State selection:** When selecting states for inclusion in ESSPIN, consider a greater geo-political balance than obtains at present. When doing this, also consider States, such as Oyo, that have hitherto demonstrated good performance in the education sector. Poverty abounds in all States, whether in the rural north or in the urban sprawl of a city such as Ibadan.
- 4.3.3 **No ESSPIN offices:** Avoid the temptation to establish ‘ESSPIN offices’ in the style of the present CUBE Offices. Likewise avoid project branding of vehicles (use government logos and government number plates). Do not refurbish offices and provide equipment for TA without extending this to the offices of senior officials (PS, Directors, Secretariat), especially in essentials such as decent working conditions, tools of the trade, electricity, internet connections, etc. There is a strong case for not having project offices at all. Instead, place well-chosen national and international TA alongside government officials in mentoring-guidance-shadow positions, from PS level (if requested) down to key directorates in planning and finance¹⁹.

¹⁹ These TA would, however, need to have the tools of the trade (power supply, internet connections, etc). By provided them with these ‘in situ’, their counterparts would and should become similarly ‘enhanced’.

- 4.3.4 **No subordination of DFID principles:** Apart from Government, DFID is the lead partner in ESSPIN. Do not subordinate DFID principles and approaches to other partners with less flexible procedures that do not take into consideration national constraints and preferences.
- 4.3.5 **No DFID ‘hands off’ approach:** Although DFID will very probably appoint a management team (whose cost proposals will be carefully scrutinised) DFID should not adopt an entirely hands-off stance. DFID education and other advisors must get involved on a timetabled basis, especially where their expertise can add value.
- 4.3.6 **Joint annual reviews:** Demonstrate the meaning of partnership and participation by holding joint annual reviews of education performance (government and DPs in partnership) (whether whole sector or UBE). This links to 4.3.1 above.
- 4.3.7 **SUBEB for UBE - MoE for whole sector:** Apart from SWAp, annual work planning and financial planning, concentrate UBE benefits in the UBEC-SUBEB-LGEA axis (rather than the FMoE- SMoE axis where the overall responsibility is ‘whole sector’ rather than UBE).
- 4.3.8 **Support Islamiyyah schools:** Tap into the huge potential UBE gains through direct support to and sharing of project benefits with Islamiyyah schools (and any other positive components of the Q and T parts of IQTE) as part of the mainstream provision of UBE , especially in the northern States (other FBO-schools in other States).
- 4.3.9 **Make SBMCs a main thrust:** Support the SBMCs through the provision of resources that will provide real management challenges. Do this in such a way that State governments are obliged to follow suit.
- 4.3.10 **Head teachers rule OK:** Apart from literacy and numeracy, prioritise professional training in schools on strengthening the management and community-relations skills of head teachers. Good head teachers will do more for a school than any other single group – they are the pivot and focus of schools in their communities (and, it is arguable, of the entire education system).
- 4.3.11 **PR for UBE:** From the very beginning, use the media positively to promote these initiatives as part of Government policy in action (not ESSPIN).

End of OPR Report

M F Macrae, S A Adediran

